REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application. However, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

Drawings:

Fig. 22 is objected to because it is allegedly of poor quality. However, as explained in paragraph [0066] of the published application, the purpose of Fig. 22 is to show images of differing qualities. Therefore, it is necessary to have the images of Fig. 22 in poor quality. Accordingly, the quality of Fig. 22 is fine, it is just intended to show images of poor quality. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to Fig. 22.

Title:

As requested by the Examiner, a new title has been provided.

Art Rejections:

Claims 1 – 14 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being unpatentable over USP 5,978,551, hereinafter *Koyama*.

The present invention provides an efficient method of generating images from an external recording of hierarchically encoded data of a plurality of images. In order to minimize the wait time for the pictures to be displayed, the present invention enables the prints to be generated after only a low level of data has been downloaded. Once the low level of data has been downloaded, the pictures can be

printed, and then higher levels of image data can be subsequently downloaded for printing higher resolution images.

Contrary to the present invention, *Koyama* does not use hierarchically coded data, as well as a decoder for decoding the coded data. As can be seen from Figs. 35 and 36 of *Koyama*, *Koyama* teaches displaying the picture index file (step S93 of Fig. 36) ***after*** all of the data has been recorded (step S71 of Fig. 35). According to Fig. 35, the flowchart does not progress to part B (Fig. 36) until step S71 is answered in the affirmative, i.e., that all three kinds of data have been downloaded. Accordingly, *Koyama* would not achieve the purposes of the present invention that are stated above.

Specifically, although *Koyama* includes a hierarchical directory, *Koyama* does not teach or suggest ***hierarchical encoding***. See paragraph [0042] of the published application. Accordingly, *Koyama* does not teach or suggest the present invention. The Examiner's attention is also directed to claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 18, and 19. Those claims emphasize other distinctions over *Koyama*. For example, *Koyama* does not teach or suggest the ability to make the index prints after only a first level of data has been recorded. Accordingly, *Koyama* does not teach or suggest the present invention or the advantages thereof.

Claims 15 – 21 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Koyama* in view of "well known principles in the art of image processing". In accordance with § 2144.03 of the MPEP, the Examiner is respectfully requested to provide support for the "well known principles in the art of image processing" or else withdraw the rejection.

Nevertheless, claims 15 – 21 are patentable over the applied art at least for the reasons set forth above.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections and rejections.

New claims 22-24 have been added, and which define the coded data as compressed data. Those claims are patentable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 9, and 15.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this response, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned in order to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: September 21, 2007 By: William C Rowland

William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620